DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 999 RC 007 111

AUTHOR	Photiadis, John; And Others
TITLE	The Impact of Community Size and Urbanization on Values, Alienation and Satisfaction.
PUB DATE	25 Aug 73
NOTE	29p.; Paper presented at the Rural Sociological Society Annual Meetings, College Park, Maryland, August 23-26, 1973
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Size; Education; Family Life; Living Standards; Physical Health; Religion; *Rural Areas; *Sociology; Tables (Data); *Urbanization; *Values
IDENTIFIERS	*West Virginia

ABSTRACT

The testing of theoretical propositions concerning homogeneity and isolation in rural communities was examined in terms of community size. The 1,100 male adult respondents in West Virginia were chosen through a cluster stratified sample. Sampling strata were based on size of community, region of the state, and socioeconomic status. Data were reported and findings discussed for preferences in life styles, religious beliefs and participation, attitudes toward integration into the larger society, level of living, alienation, religion and primary groups as buffers to the outside world, perception of physical health, and satisfaction with life. (PS)

ED 078999

RECEIVED
AUG 27 1973
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE IMPACT OF COMMUNITY SIZE AND URBANIZATION ON VALUES, ALIENATION AND SATISFACTION

By

John Photiadis, Beryl Maurer, Neil Weller

West Virginia Univeristy

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Society
Held in College Park Maryland, August 1973

RC007111

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ALIENATION IN THE SMALL COMMUNITY

Constants such as homogenuity and isolation today differentiate probably less than before, larger from small rural communities. For instance, the factor isolation is not as important as before and so is the possibility for extensive and restrictuve face to face interaction within the small rural community. Changes in transportation, communication, out-migration and the flight to the fringe are examples of factors which could easily influence the impact of these constants and reduce the differences they produce. Still the constants exist, although not as distinct as before, justifying the testing of theoretical propositions examined in terms of community size, which is our objective here. For instance, it should be useful to look at value orientation of smaller as compared to the larger communities or the way their members relate to the larger society. Are there more eunomic attributes associated with the smaller community as Durkheim suggested[1] or as some recent studies, including studies of small businessmen, have pointed out the opposite ~~is~~ true today.[2] The latter studies speculate that due to the lack of means to perform in line with the expectations of larger societies, smaller communities which now use the larger society as a reference group more than before tend to produce more anomic or alienated individuals than larger communities.

---

1. Emile Durkheim, "Suicide," Translated by John Spaulding and George Simpson, The Free Press, 1951.

2. See John Photiadis, "Social Integration of Businessmen in Varied Size Communities," Social Forces, Vol. 46, No. 2, Dec. 1967. Also see "Change in Rural Appalachia," Edited by John Photiadis and Harry Schwarzweller, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970, Chapter 1.

The purpose of this paper, then, is to: first, in reference to seven types of communities, classified in terms of size examine selected socio-psychological attributes such as value orientations, degree of identification with the larger society, feelings of alienation from it, and needs to alleviate anxieties produced by modern societal complexities and changes; second, in addition to these attributes and their consequences which might be associated or could lead to mental stresses examine perception of one's physical health before we examine the respondents satisfaction with life including satisfaction with life in his community. Because if people in small villages are found to be more alienated and less healthy physically one might wonder why they stay in the small community. Finally, in the light of findings from the testing of the above propositions examine more theoretical considerations dealing with the incorporation of the smaller community into the larger society and of its consequences.

METHODOLOGY

The sample includes 1100 male adult respondents chosen through a cluster stratified sample. The population universe is the state of West Virginia. Sampling strata are selected on the basis of: "(a) size of community; (b) region of the state (mining and non-mining, northern and southern part of the state); and (c) socio-economic stauts. Thus one larger town, Morgantown, and two entire counties, Mineral and

Hardy, were selected from the northern part of the state and one city, Charleston, and one county, Raleigh, from the southern part. Inside these communities, smaller communities in particular, the nth household was interviewed. For larger communities, a stratified cluster sample based on neighborhood socio-economic status was drawn. Thus the town of Keyser, Mineral County, was divided into nine segments representing five different socio-economic strata. For each socio-economic stratum one segment was retained, and the nth household within the segment was marked for interview. In addition to the procedures used for the three counties a similar but more elaborate procedure was followed to interview respondents in the larger cities of Charleston and Morgantown. In the case of Charleston, nineteen segments representing eight different socio-economic strata were selected for interview. Thus besides open country and towns of less than 2,000, the following towns were included in the sample: Piedmont and Keyser, Mineral County,(population, 2,000 and 6,192, respectively); Beckley, Raleigh County (population 18,642); Morgantown, Monongalia County (population 22,487); and Charleston, Kanawa County (population 85,796)."

There is one independent variable in this analysis: community size. Operational definition of the dependent variables are given along with their analysis.

There are at least four different ways of examining communities in relation to dimensions like size: (1) through a comparison of what

we call "ideal types" communities; (2) through the "trait complex" type of analysis; (3) through an analysis based on a continuum; and (4) through an analysis based on the "rural-urban dichotomy."[3] For all four types of approaches recent drastic societal changes have made the analysis in terms of size in some ways less meaningful than before.[4]

---

3. In the case of "ideal types" we examine communities of different sizes on the basis of all the important characteristics known to be associated with communities of a particular kind. For instance, we compare communities on the basis of abstract characteristics known to be associated with the small rural community, in general. The opposite would be true if we were interested in analyzing urban communities. The ideal urban community which we would have used as a basis for comparison would have, in abstract form, all the characteristics one might find in general descriptions of urban communities. In the analysis of ideal types, it is not necessary that we examine communities on the basis of the same characteristics.

Examination, however, on the basis of similar characteristics is necessary in the trait-complex type of analysis. In this case we compare communities of various sizes on the basis of selected individual variables which are usually related to each other in a meaningful way. For all these variables, size might be assumed to be the underlined causal factor.

The third type of approach which we could use in the comparison of communities of various sizes is what we call analysis on the basis of a continuum. This approach deals with the testing of hypotheses by employing variations in selected variables that occur in accordance with changes on a continuum. For instance, the more we move towards one end of the continuum the more a characteristic is hypothesized as changing in intensity. A requirement for this type of analysis is that all samples included in our sample have similar basic attributes; for instance, we should not include suburban small communities along with rural farm communities.

In those cases in which we cannot assume that our main variable, for instance community size, is a continuum but in which we want to test hypotheses in the manner we would have used by employing the notion of the continuum, we use what we call a dichotomy.

4. Even a few decades ago the application of any of the four forms of classifications was possible with much less interference of intervening variables. Today, if we were to consider some of the new changes such as the rural-urban migration or the flight to the fringe of the cities, one can understand that dramatic changes have altered traditional notions, including conception of urban continuum or the rural urban dichotomy.

Still, in spite of such changes, analysis in relation to any of the four types of analysis remains meaningful because a number of the constants which in the past determined the differences along a continuum or a dichotomy still exist. What, of course, has changed in recent years is, that a number of additional intervening variables have entered the picture. Therefore, if we are to examine the rural-urban dimension in terms of say, a continuum or a dichotomy, it is necessary in some way to take these intervening variables under consideration.[5] Furthermore, and probably because of the presence of intervening variables such as those we mentioned above in recent years it often became necessary to use, instead of one, a combination of types of analysis. For instance, in our case here we initially intended to use the ideal continuum as our type of analysis. The nature of the findings, however, suggested that in addition to the continuum the use of a dichotomy as a means of analysis became necessary.

With the above in mind, let us turn to our findings and begin with the

---

5. In the present study an example of such consideration is the separate treatment of small communities in Mineral and Raleigh Counties of West Virginia which is the state from which we have collected our data. Raleigh County, located at the southern part of the state of West Virginia, is a mining county with many characteristics described in studies of rural communities. The other, Mineral County, is located in the northern part of the state; it is close to a small industrial town, and has some industry of its own. The presence of employment opportunities, as is the case for small communities in Mineral County, does not only make it different from the point of view of income, but also from the point of its impact on the dependence of one individual--in the family for instance--on the other, which is influenced by the extent of employment opportunities available.

study of "preferences as to ways of life" people in different size communities prefer, religious beliefs, of desires to be like people elsewhere in the country, and actual level of living, before we examine the alienation which these conditions could produce and the use of religious primary groups as a means of alleviating anxieties produced by modern complexity.

FINDINGS

Preferences as to ways of life: Values are criteria which help us decide what is good and bad, right or wrong, important and unimportant, and desirable and undesirable. Behavior in line with our values often help us alleviate anxieties produced by imposing social processes.

What we measure in this study is not values per se but, because the measurement of values usually requires extensive elaboration, we only deal with what we call "preferences as to ways of life", which are only indicators and close correlaries of underlined corresponding values.

In measuring preferences as to ways of life, respondents were asked to rank according to their preference three different sets of nine questions each dealing with a different way of life. The nine ways of life examined in the study are those in line with: religion, family, work, education, friendship, material comfort, achievement, recreation and outdoor living.

Table I shows accomparison of the seven types of communities we use in our analysis and the four "preferences as to ways of life" which seem to differentiate these seven communities more than the remaining five.

A life in line with religion is preferred more by medium and small size communities, as compared to Charleston and Morgantown, the more urban type communities where only about 51 and 47 percent, respectively have high scores

in preferring a life in line with religion.[6] The difference between the two larger and the remaining communities is significant at the one percent level. There are no statistical differences among the smaller communities. The opposite seems to be true concerning life in line with work and also with recreation where, as compared to Charleston and Morgantown[7] smaller and medium size communities seem to value them less. Statistical differences between smaller and larger communities are again at the one percent level. In a similar fashion, Charleston and Morgantown also value more than medium and small size communities a style of life emphasizing material conveniences. The differences between the two larger communities and the small but more industrialized town of Keyser is not by itself significant.

The nine ways of life preference we deal with in this study have also been examined in terms of a simple rank order. The findings presented elsewhere indicated that for Charleston and Morgantown, family life ranks first and religion second.[8] The opposite is true for the remaining five smaller communities where "life in line with religion" ranks uniformly first and "family life" second. The same dichotomy exists in relation to the third in rank way of life preference, which for the larger two centers is work, while for all other smaller communities education is third in rank.[9]

---

6. It is quite probable that socio-economic status, one aspect of which is education, might be a intervening factor determining these differences.

7. Here again it is quite probable that the type of occupation which, as we said, is associated with community size might also influence differences among such communities.

8. John Photiadis & Harry Schwarzweller, op. cit., Chapter 1.

9. Other studies have also indicated that rural people in West Virginia have more favorable attitudes towards education but they prefer more technical education and are less willing to pay taxes for better education.

A style of life in line with education in turn ranks fourth for the two larger centers, while for the smaller communities fourth is friendship.[10]

What is from methodological point of view noticeable in this analysis is that there is a definite dichotomy between the two more urban centers, Charleston and Morgantown, and the rest of the communities. Among the latter and in relation to all four values there are no noticeable differences (see the five columns at the right side of Table I). Morgantown, which is not much larger in size than Beckley, but has more urban attributes--to an extent due to the fact that West Virginia University is located there, and to its proximity to the city of Pittsburgh--is much more similar to Charleston in terms of style of life preferences than to Beckley, which is more isolated and in the midst of a more culturally distinct rural mining area.

Finally, data from Table I examined in terms of rank order correlation, which might give some indication of the presence of a continuum, do not show statistical differences when all seven types of communities are examined simultaneously.

---

10. For the larger centers the fifth "way of life preference" is one where friendship is important while for all other communities it is work. Similar differences exist among the remaining four preferences, but the pattern is not as clear. As it might be expected differences are more dramatic when more important behavior aspects, and in our case higher ranking values patterns, are concerned.

In spite of the fact that the educational level is higher in the larger communities in terms of rank order value education ranks lower. This might be the case because small communities, due to the lack of means, see education as a more crucial avenue for achieving higher economic and social status. This notion is supported by data presented elsewhere indicating that smaller communities see formal education as impractical and favor more technical and vocational training.

The differences in "preferences as to ways of life" which we have presented here are not striking; after all, small and large towns are all part of the smae larger society which nowadays uses more or less the same highly effective mass media to educate all its people. In terms of ranking more differences amount to differences of one single rank; however, when one considers the extensive amount of everyday behavior which stems out of a single value, or "way of life preference" in our case, one can realize the magnitude of the differences.[11]

Religious beliefs and participation: One of the important differences in "preferences as to ways of life" we described previously was life in line with religion which was more important for people in the smaller communities as compared to the two larger ones. Table 2 shows that similar differences exist concerning religious beliefs.[12] There is a smaller proportion of strong believers in the two larger and more urban centers, Charleston and Morgantown, about 59 percent, as compared to the rest of the communities. This difference is significant at the one percent level. Furthermore, among the five smaller communities there is a statistical difference between communities in Raleigh County--Beckley and Open Country--which culturally is more typical rural Appalachia than the rest of the three types of communities in Mineral and Hardy Counties located in the northern part of the state. This difference is also significant at the one percent level.

---

11. For instance, concerning everyday life, a number of alternatives that have to do with religion tend to appear more attractive to a small towner as compared to an urbanite; and the opposite is true for alternatives that have to do with material comfort.

12. For a description of the scale see John Photiadis, West Virginians in Their Own State and In Cleveland, Ohio," Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, Research Report No. 3, 1970.

The differences which we discussed above becomes more pronounced when it comes to the aspect of belief which deals with a question suggesting that "the world is soon coming to an end" (Table 2) and which implys fundamentalism, an attfibute of southern Appalachian culture. Again both the differences between the two larger centers and the rest of the communities, and within these five types of communities the differences between the two Raleigh County communities--Beckley and Open Country--and those located in the northern part of the state (which is a non-mining area) are significant at the one percent level.

The above data then suggests that belief is associated negatively to size but cultural variations, such as those dealing with the stronger beliefs and fundamentalism of the mining region of Raleigh County, act as intervening variables influencing the linearity of the relationship.

Let us now see what the situation is with church participation which, as a dimension could be more social in nature than either beliefs or values and probably less important as an anxiety relieving mechanism.[13]

When it comes to frequency of church participation (Table 2) the previous negative relationships between religiosity and size do not exist and as a matter of fact in some cases become reversed. Charleston and Morgantown, the two larger communities, have a larger proportion of frequent participants, over 50 percent, as compared to Raleigh County--Beckley and Open Country--which had the larger proportion of strong believers. The difference is again significant at the one percent level. In other words,

---

13. For an examination of social attributes of religiosity see John Photiadis, "Overt Conformity to Church Teaching as a Function of Religious Beliefs and Group Participation," American Jounral of Sociology, V of LXX, 4, Jan. 1965.

in Charleston and Morgantown there is a larger proportion of respondents who go to church often although they are not believers, or at least are not strong believers. On the other hand, there is a number of people and in particular in the southern part of the state of West Virginia who although believers are not even members of a church. Due to either social or cultural and even personal reasons the normally expected negative relationship between community size and church participation, at least as our data show, does not always exist. In terms of the function of religion as a means of alleviating anxieties produced by modern changes, the presence of respondents who are believers but not members of a church could be explained in terms of the inability of certain churches to satisfy psychological needs produced by drastic changes which took place in rural Appalachia recently.[14]

The role of the church to alleviate anxieties produced by modern changes which we mentioned above will be examined later. Let us look at the interest of Appalachian communities to become like the rest of the country in terms of income, level of living and similar themes, then look at their actual level of living and if there is a gap see if it is associated with alienation and in turn use of religion as a means of alleviating anxieties which alienation and similar dislocations might produce.

---

14. For a description of these changes and their repercussion see "Change in Rural Appalachia," Edited by John Photiadis and Harry Schwarzweller, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970. What is of cource more difficult to explain in the case of abstaining from the church is the fact that in the smaller communities we have strong beliefs without the conventional ritual--primarily church participation--which through conditioning intensifies existing beliefs and vice versa, thus helping the building of the mutual dependence between ritual and belief and the strengthening of the beliefs.

Attitudes towards integration into the larger society: Integration into the larger society is measured here in terms of the extent of an individual's desire to see Appalachia become like the rest of the country in terms of income, style of life, business-like attitudes, education and habits and customs. Table 3 shows, inspite of what one might expect, that the two larger communities, probably because they are already more in line with the larger society, have less favorable attitudes in becoming like the rest of society than the smaller ones. Among the smaller communities again those of the more isolated Raleigh County--Beckley and Open Country--are different from the other three smaller communities having more favorable attitudes than they do towards integration. The relationship in the two sets of compared communities are significant at the one or five percent level.

(Table 3 about here)

Similar patterns of differences, although is some cases not as pronounced, exist when it comes to each individual scale item including the item which deal with desirability to have the income the rest of the country has.

Level of living: Census data indicate that smaller communities in West Virginia have lower incomes than the larger ones and in particular in comparison to people living in the open country. Table 4 indicates that the same is true for level of living which is related positively to community size.[15] Furthermore, the rank order correlation of all seven communities is significant at the one percent level and this is the first

15. Suburban communities are not included in the sample.

dimension we have encountered up to this point where examination in terms of a continuum appears more meaningful than a dichotomy. Possession of household facilities, automobiles and also items associated with mass media such as telephones, T.V., and newspapers have been used as criteria for determining "Level of Living".[16] In terms of community size differences between smaller and larger communities are much smaller when it comes to what are considered absolute necessities and to items which are not very expensive. But, when it comes to mass media, and in particular basic ones, such as black and white T.V., newspapers and telephones the differences between smaller and larger communities are much smaller. In other words, concerning this form of communication, small and large communities have the same potential for receiving similar messages about styles of life, and in particular level of living items which are so often advertised as possessions or desirable possessions of the urban middle class, the what is becoming more important reference group for the small towner. Facility to more or less receive similar messages in relation to level of living items associated with expectations of larger society, strong desire to become incorporated into the larger society and less possession of both means and actual level of living items are conditons which as previously indicated might lead to higher alienation in the smaller as compared to larger community.

Alienation: Alienation is measured here in terms of the aspect,

---

16. For a more detailed description of the scale items see bulletin, "West Virginians in Their Own State and In Cleveland, Ohio," op. cit.

dealing with bewilderment and confusion.[17] The scale is measured with six items measuring bewilderment and confusion produced by the way today's society functions and in particular in terms of social and economic dislocations and complexity.

Table 5 shows that a smaller proportion of respondents with high scores on the "bewilderment and confusion scale" exist in the two more urban communities, and in particular in Charleston, the only metropolitan area we deal with here. In that city the proportion of those with high scores is about 64 percent and in Morgantown about 77 percent and higher in the smaller communities. The differences in scores between the two larger and the rest of the communities is significant at the one percent level. On the other hand, there is no pattern in variations among the five smaller communities. Beckley, which is the largest community among the five smaller ones has the highest scores in the bewilderment and confusion scale.[18] In terms of rank order, therefore, the relationship between size and bewilderment and confusion (is) is not statistically significant.

The highest alienation scores which we have found in the smaller communities as compared to the larger ones are not in line with findings from

---

17. This aspects has been chosen instead of other, for instance, anomia or powerlessness which are used more often in similar studies because it was felt that rural Appalachians do not see lack of order in society and do not feel excluded from it, which is whan anomia measures and neither feel powerlessness for doing things they want to do simply because, they could migrate if they wanted to and achieve more of the things urbanites have. Betwe felt that bewilderment and confusion is a better measure simply because small towners like many of the things urbanites have, but they also like many of the things their community can offer.

18. The reader should be reminded here again that during the time these data were collected there was considerable depression in Beckley and Raleigh County due to a crisis in the coal industry.

early classical studies of alienation such as those conducted by Durkheim and which point to the lower alienation of the small community as compared to the urban center. The nature, however, of the recent transition of the rural society, which we briefly discussed above can explain this reversal. Similar studies elsewhere, for instance, studies of small businessmen in the midwest where different alienation dimensions have been used, similarly point to the higher alienation of the small towner.[19]

If alienation which is known to be associated with frustration and in turn anxiety is actually higher in the smaller community, one should expect that in the small community there should be stronger need to alleviate anxieties of this nature and more so alleviate them through behavior in line with what small towners value.

Religion and primary groups as buffers to the outside world: We have shown previously that religiosity and familism are associated with small community size (Table 1) behavior in line with these values should be an important anxiety relieving mechanism for this group.

Religion as a buffer to the outside world is measured with five questions measuring direct or indirect feelings of need and perception of need to alleviate through religion, anxieties produced by the modern world.[20] The upper part of Table 6 shows that the two more urban communities, Charleston and Morgantown have lower proportions of respondents who use religion as a means of alleviating anxieties produced by modern complexity and changes. The difference is most dramatic when one compares Charleston with about 28

---

19. See John Photiadis, "Integration of Businessmen in Various Size Communities," op. cit.

20. The scale has been tested for internal consistency.

percent respondents with high scores in the scale which measure use of religion as a buffer is compared to Open Country Raleigh County, where the proportions of respondents with high scores is about 66 percent. Differences between the two larger and the rest of the communities as well as the differences between Charleston and Open Country Raleigh County are significant at the one percent level. Furthermore, there is a significant relationship between community size and use of religion as a buffer to the outside world when one considers all seven types of communities in terms of rank order. Concerning this dimension then, analysis both in terms of a dichotomy or of a continuum is meaningful.

Use of primary groups as buffers to the outside world is measured with only two questions, one measuring use of family and kinship group and the other of friends as means of alleviating anxieties produced by modern societal change and complexity. The middle part of Table 6 shows that when it comes to use of primary groups as buffers there is no distinct patterns differentiating communitites in terms of size, although there are significant differences when one compares Raleigh County--Beckley and Open Country--with the rest of the communities; Raleigh County showing higher proportion of respondents who use primary groups as a means of alleviating the type of anxieties we are examining here.[21] In other words, excluding the situation in Raleigh County, which we assume is culturally determined

21. When the two questions which comprise this scale are examined separately a slightly different pattern exists. More specifically friends become considerably more important for the five smaller communities as compared to the two more urban ones.

or has to do with the economic depression of the area at the time the study was conducted we could say that primary groups as a means of alleviating anxieties produced by modern complexity and change are important regardless of community size.

After considering some of the socio-psychological stresses and some mechanisms of their alleviation, let us look at the satisfaction with life of people who live in different size communities. But before we do that let us look at the perception of physical health of our respondents which, considering the selectivity of the migration process might be an important dimension differentiating communities in terms of an aspects of life which is both important from the point of view of strain but also in terms of satisfaction with life the dimension we will examine later.

Perception of physical health: Table 7 includes responses to one question which refers to the way one perceives his physical health. Significantly higher proportions of respondents from the two more urban centers--Charleston and Morgantown--perceive their health as excellent or good as compared to the other community types. The opposite is true concerning the proportion of these who perceive their health as poor or very poor. The relationship is significant at the one percent level. As it has been the case with most social dimensions by far the more pronounced is the difference between Charleston and Open Country Raleigh County. There are about 36 percent of the respondents in Charleston who feel that their health is excellent and only about one percent who perceive that their health is poor or very poor. But in Open Country Raleigh County only about 12 percent perceive their health as excellent and only 28 perceive it as poor or very poor.

Finally, careful examination of the relationship between size and perception of health could reveal that Raleigh County--Beckley and Country--does not follow at exactly the same rate the patterns of differentiation as community size changes.[22]

Satisfaction with life: To summarize the last few tables we could say that in smaller communities and in particular communities with more rural characteristics, we have a more frequent perception of poor health, lower level of living, but more desires for integration into the larger society, including integration in terms of income and level of living, and in turn stronger feelings of alienation from society and the consequential need to alleviate anxieties produced by alienation and other attributes. However, besides attributes such as these--which could lead to less satisfaction with life--we also have in the small community stronger religious values and often fundamentalist in nature, stronger value of friendship and more use of religion and primary groups--in particular frienship groups--to alleviate anxieties produced by modern complexity. Let us now see how all these conditions and certainly others we have not mentioned here balance each other and determine one's satisfaction with life.

Life satisfaction is measured with seven items measuring the respondents satisfaction with his job, his ability to do the things he wants to do, his income, the kind of life his community can offer, the Appalachian region

---

22. Beckley, for instance, which is large in size excluding Open Country Raleigh County, has the highest proportion of respondents whose health is either poor or very poor and this is the case in spite of the fact that Beckley is known to have proportionally high number of hospitals.

can offer and finally satisfaction with his life in general. The items have been tested for internal consistency.

Table 8 shows that in terms of satisfaction with life there are no significant differences with community size. Similar lack of statistical differences exist when the seven individual questions which measure satisfaction are examined separately, including satisfaction with income one is making (shown on the lower part of Table 8).[23] This lack of differences in satisfaction among West Virginians alos exist when these same questions were used to compare West Virginians who live in the suburbs of Cleveland, those in the Appalachian ghetto of Cleveland, those migrants who have returned to West Virginia and finally, people who never left the state. The lack of relationship among the four groups was retained when age and education were controlled.[24]

In the light of such data then we could say that people who live in the hollows of Raleigh County and those who live in Charleston are satisfied the same with their life including the kind of life their community can offer or the income they are making. And furthermore, this is the case in spite of income differences, differences in health, etc., that exist in various types of communities. It is quite probably that if our society could not offer the opportunity for mobility it now does, there might be differences in satisfaction.. Because it is quite probable that people

---

23. Distribution for each of the seven questions in terms of size are shown in John Photiadis, "Community Size and Social Attributes in West Virginia," op. cit., p. 23.

24. John Photiadis, "West Virginians in Their Own State and in Cleveland, Ohio," op. cit., Footnote 17.

in the small community feel that under the rules of the game they either have or had their chances to alter their conditions but have chosen to stay and do what they are doing now. In other words, due to the reasons we discussed in the first part of this paper a man from an Appalachian hollow feels that he can move to the city where he can either stay or return to his small community and in that case he might use anxiety relieving mechanisms his community can offer to cope with his frustrations.[25]

Finally, in the light of the lack of differences in satisfaction between hollows with their short comings and larger urban centers, one might look at the aims of action programs and in particular those concentrating on rural communities of low income. In other words, in the light of the processes we described here one might ask if it is advisable to encourage a man in the hollow to be less satisfied with the material aspects of his level of living, which is what we actually do now, instead of looking inside the individual to see what is happening to his internal world during this period of rapid change.[26]

---

25. The crucial factor here is the acceptance of the rules of the game society uses; deductions from these data, although in some ways superficial, suggest that people both in the hollows or the larger centers accept the rules of the game the same way.

26. John Photiadis, and Harry Schwarzweller, "Change in Rural Appalachia, op. cit., Chapter 1.

Table 1 PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS PLACING HIGHER VALUE ON LIFE IN LINE WITH RELIGION, WORK, MATERIAL CONVENIENCES AND RECREATION

Proportion with High scores favoring Life in line with:	Charles-ton N=146	Morgan-town N=150	Beckley N=107	Keyser N=107	Sml. Twn Min.-Hard. N=130	Open Contr. Min.-Hard N=236	Open Contr. Raleigh Co. N=246
Religion	50.7%	47.3%	81.2%	76.4%	66.4%	67.5%	75.2%
	x^2=53.80, P<0.01		Z=0.96, P>0.05				
Work	70.7	65.3	48.5	46.2	52.3	43.5	49.9
	x^2=31.80, P<0.01		Z=1.49, P<0.10				
Recreation	40.7	44.5	25.0	32.1	28.9	28.3	26.9
	x^2=2.90, P<0.01		Z=1.49, P<0.10				
Material Convenience	76.4	59.6	44.0	59.4	45.3	47.3	50.1
	x^2=30.10, P<0.01		Z=1.22, P>0.05				

Table 2 RELIGION BELIEF AND PARTICIPATION SCALES

Intensity or Agreement	Charles-ton N=146	Morgan-town N=150	Beckley N=103	Keyser N=107	Sml. Twn. Min.-Hard. N=130	Open Contr. Min.-Hard. N=236	Open Contr. Raleigh Co. N=246
	Orthodox belief scale.						
High	58.7	58.7	92.7	79.8	79.1	77.5	91.4
Low	41.3	41.3	7.3	20.2	20.9	22.5	8.6
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	x^2=78.40, P 0.01		Z=0.35, P 0.05				
	Question: I believe that the world is soon coming to an end.						
Agreement*	13.3	19.9	67.0	37.5	33.1	42.3	62.7
Disagreement	86.7	80.1	33.0	62.5	66.9	57.7	37.3
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	x^2=97.20, P 0.01		Z=1.49, P 0.01				
	Question: How often do you attend church?						
Frequently	51.4	53.3	25.8	56.1	56.9	47.2	40.9
Occasionally	39.4	30.7	57.4	31.8	33.8	38.7	32.3
Not at all	9.2	16.0	17.8	12.2	9.3	14.1	26.8
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	x^2=4.26, P 0.05		Z=0.35, P 0.05				

*Combines strong, moderate, and slight intensity of agreement or disagreement.

Table 3 ATTITUDES TOWARD INTEGRATION WITH THE REST OF THE COUNTRY SCALE

Intensity or Agreement	Charleston N=146	Morgantown N=150	Beckley N=103	Keyser N-107	Sml. Twn. Min.-Hard. N=130	Open Contr. Min.-Hard. N=236	Open Contr. Raleigh Co. N=246
More Favorable	73.5	73.1	95.1	86.0	86.9	84.7	93.9
Less Favorable	26.5	26.9	4.9	14.0	14.0	15.3	6.1
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

$x^2=43.8$, $P<.01$

$Z=1.05$, $P<0.10$

Table 4 LEVEL OF LIVING SCALE

	Charles-ton N=146	Morgan-town N=150	Beckley N=103	Keyser N=107	Sml. Twn. Min.-Hard. N=130	Open Contr. Min.-Hard. N=236	Open Contr. Raleigh Co. N=246
High	100.0	98.1	95.1	91.5	93.7	71.3	77.1
Low	0.0	1.9	4.9	8.5	6.3	28.7	22.9
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

$x^2=52.0$, $P<0.01$

$Z=2.28$, $P<0.01$

Table 5 BEWILDERMENT AND CONFUSION SCALE

	Charles-ton N=146	Morgan-town N=150	Beckley N=103	Keyser N=107	Sml. Twn. Min.-Hard. N=130	Open Contr. Min.-Hard. N=236	Open Contr. Raleigh Co. N=246
High	64.4	77.0	94.9	83.2	78.3	89.7	86.1
Low	35.6	23.0	5.1	16.8	21.7	10.3	13.9
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

$x^2=66.90$, $P<.01$

$Z=1.05$, $P>.05$

Table 6 USE OF RELIGION AND PRIMARY GROUPS
AS BUFFERS TO THE OUTSIDE WORLD

	Charles-ton N=146	Morgan-town N=150	Beckley N=103	Keyser N=107	Sml. Twn. Min.-Hard. N=130	Open Contr. Min.-Hard. N=236	Open Contr. Raleigh Co. N=246
Use of religion as a buffer to the outside world scale							
High	27.7	40.0	57.4	64.6	58.5	58.2	66.2
Low	72.3	60.0	42.6	35.4	41.5	41.8	33.8
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	x^2=67.70, P< .01			Z=2.10, P< 0.01			
Use of primary groups as buffer to the outside world scale.							
High	76.7	77.7	92.1	75.7	63.1	64.7	87.2
Low	23.3	22.3	7.9	24.3	36.9	35.3	12.8
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	x^2=0.17, P > .05			Z=0.54, P 0.05			

Table 7 PERCEPTION OF ONE'S HEALTH

	Charles-ton N=146	Morgan-town N=150	Beckley N=103	Keyser N=107	Sml. Twn. Min.-Hard. N=130	Open Contr. Min.-Hard. N=236	Open Contr. Raleigh Co. N=246
Excellent	36.3	36.9	20.2	27.4	18.0	19.8	11.6
Good	52.1	32.5	40.3	45.3	45.3	44.3	33.9
Fair	9.6	25.6	26.0	18.9	26.6	23.2	26.3
Poor or very poor	1.4	4.4	3.5	8.5	10.2	12.6	27.9
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

$x^2=36.7$, $P < .01$

$Z=1.66$, $P = 0.05$

Table 8 LIFE SATISFACTION SCALE

	Charles-ton N=146	Morgan-town N=150	Beckley N=103	Keyser N=107	Sml. Twn. Min.-Hard. N=130	Open Contr. Min.-Hard. N=236	Open Contr. Raleigh Co. N=246
High	67.6	59.5	65.7	71.4	65.4	59.7	66.0
Low	32.4	40.5	34.3	28.6	34.6	40.3	34.0
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

x^2=0.13, P .05

Z=0.18, P 0.05